

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 288

EA 019 352

AUTHOR Stevens, Wolfgang; Marsh, David D.
TITLE The Role of Vision in the Life of Elementary School Principals.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Elementary Education; Interviews; *Leadership Styles; Organizational Development; *Organizational Objectives; *Principals
IDENTIFIERS Administrator Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

Principals can be categorized as initiators, managers, or responders according to the extent to which they initiate significant change, accommodate change through effective management, or react to developments only as they occur. An interview-based study of 12 elementary school principals, four of whom were placed in each of the three categories by their supervisors, suggested that the visions that initiators held for the development of their schools were of longer range and greater scope than those held by managers or responders. The initiators tended to develop a greater number of visions and to integrate them better than did managers or responders, and were relatively more interested in program-related matters. Managers and responders were more concerned with facilities than were initiators. Responders were particularly interested in bureaucratic matters and in satisfying others. Managers worked toward attaining their visions, but less persistently than did initiators. Initiators used the greatest range of strategies to achieve their visions, and worked hardest at them. This paper reviews the literature on leadership styles, then describes the study purposes, methodology, sample, findings, and conclusions. Implications for the selection of effective principals are considered. Twenty-two references are cited. (PGD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED281288

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David D.
Marsh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE ROLE OF VISION IN THE LIFE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Wolfgang Stevens
David D. Marsh

University of Southern California

A paper presented in the symposium on analyzing administrative
behavior at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational
Research Association in Washington, D.C.. April, 1987.

EA 019 352

Background

The area of the principalship has received substantial scholarly scrutiny in recent years. For example, Manasse (1984) looked at effective principals; Brightman (1984) investigated processes to assist principals in making better decisions; Dwyer (1984) researched successful principals; Hall, Rutherford, Hord, and Huling (1984) looked at elementary principal styles; Willower (1982) observed the behavior of elementary school principals; and Peterson (1978) analyzed the tasks of principals. The role of the principal has emerged as one which represents substantial diversity of thought among the various groups concerned with schools. Principals themselves are not clear as a group about what their role is or ought to be. Nevertheless, some areas of agreement seem to be emerging.

There appear to be essentially two major opposing orientations regarding the role of the principal. At one pole is the view that the principal is a manager who moves the school along familiar and expected paths. The opposite pole represents the role in which the principal is the standard bearer of school change. This change may well move the school into uncharted and troublesome areas.

The literature refers to these opposite poles with a number of similar descriptors. Under the first orientation are the roles of the principal as: "Manager-Procurer-Scheduler" (Roe & Drake, 1980); Mintzberg's Disturbance Handler" (Brightman, 1984); "Lipham's Administrator" (Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand, &

Usdan, 1980); "Typical Principal" (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973). The second orientation sees the principal as: "Educational Leader" (Roe & Drake, 1980); "Mintzberg's Entrepreneur" (Brightman, 1984); "Lipham's Leader" (Campbell et al., 1980); "Effective Principal" (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; and "Proactive Principal" (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973).

Some of the common themes linking the first managerial group are: defensive management, reactive management, crises intervention, fire-fighting approach to management, short-term concerns and survival. Perhaps the old adage of "the squeaky wheel gets the grease" applies to this reactive group. By assuming a reactive posture, the principal is driven to limiting his/her actions primarily to dealing with present circumstances. This reduces the principal's behavior to a focus on day-by-day actions and strategies which ultimately detracts from the control the school has over its direction, because the reactive principal must concentrate on whatever seems to be the most troublesome at the moment. Due to this, little time is left over to devote to long-range considerations.

A selection of commonalities in the second leader group consists of: the ability to distinguish the important from the unimportant, task orientation, initiation of action, clarity of goals, vision, and proactive behavior. The research on the principalship suggests that one of the most critical components of effective principal behavior is linked to a proactive approach. As Sergiovanni & Carver (1973) have pointed out, a

proactive stance allows one a much greater degree of control over the organization than is possible through reactive behavior. The proactive principal can more often decide which issues he/she will deal with and determine her/his own time frame. Another important factor in proactive behavior is that the principal has usually a greater opportunity to marshal his/her human and material resources more effectively.

The literature on the principal has pointed out that proactive behavior is linked to principal effectiveness. One of the preconditions of proactive behavior is vision, a mental picture of what the principal wants the school to be. Lack of vision would account for the observation that ineffective or "typical" principals (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982) are overburdened with unmanageable quantities of detail. Without vision, it seems logical that a principal would be hard pressed to make choices regarding priorities. Trider and Leithwood (1987) have reviewed and extended the research regarding what principals do.

In their investigation on the leadership role of principals as facilitators of change, Hall et al. (1984) expanded the distinction of the two opposing roles, reactive vs. proactive, to three categories. The three categories are represented in the Responder Principal, the Manager Principal, and the Initiator Principal. This is an improvement over viewing the principal as either reactive or proactive, because it includes a principal style which is a blend of reactive and proactive styles. Of the

three, the Responder Principal is the most reactive and the Initiator Principal the most proactive. The Manager Principal fall somewhere in between. These three categories represent three unique and distinct styles of bringing about change.

In the same study, Hall et al. (1984) found a link between principals' proactive behavior, vision, and effectiveness. Of the three principal styles, the Initiator Style Principal, strongest in proactive behavior and vision, tended to be most effective in terms of implementation of change. The Manager Principal was, however, seen as more effective in terms of staff morale. The Responder Principal, representing the principal style with the least proactive behavior and the least vision, emerged as the least effective principal, both in terms of staff morale and implementation success.

Dwyer (1984) also determined that effective principals were proactive and had a strong vision of what they wanted for their schools. The conclusions derived by Dwyer were that principals with vision and initiative can accomplish great improvements in their schools, provided that they are done in small steps and with meticulous attention to the "dailiness" of the improvement effort. Dwyer held the position that principals should not become involved in "grandiose" change efforts, but instead limit themselves to improvement efforts that are manageable, and then to work on a daily basis toward reaching their vision.

The day-to-day actions of Dwyer's effective principal include keeping the school functioning smoothly as well as

seizing and expanding on opportunities that will help in improving the school (Dwyer, 1984). Although this approach brought improvements to the schools in the Dwyer study, there is not much information available on the relationship of individual actions or clusters of actions and the overall vision of the principal for the school.

It seems that the various principals in the Dwyer (1984) study would exhibit one of the three leadership styles discussed by Hall et al. (1984). The main distinction between the Hall et al. and the Dwyer principals would appear to be mainly in terms of the scope of the principals' change effort.

Dwyer (1984) said that a principal needs to be proactive on an everyday basis. From the research thus far, it is uncertain exactly how leadership styles work, especially in terms of a principal's effectiveness. Many daily small steps toward the realization of the principal's vision, instead of "grandiose" change efforts are offered as the vehicle for principal effectiveness (Dwyer, 1984). There is not, however, a clear picture of just how principals translate between "vision" and "dailiness," and how "opportunities" fit in with an overall vision or plan. More information is needed on how individual school improvements relate to the principals' visions for the schools.

The work of Hall et al. (1984), regarding the three principal leadership styles relating to change efforts, provide much promise for practice. There is, however, a need for more

information regarding just how Initiator, Manager, and Responder Principals go about bringing changes to their schools. We need to know more about these different style principals in terms of the type of visions they have and how these are transformed into the concrete reality of actual practice in their schools.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was twofold: to determine what kinds of visions the principals of the different styles had for their schools, and to learn how these visions were translated into reality. The first purpose was to identify differences and commonalities of decisions as they relate to the three different principal styles. The emphasis of a principal's vision might be on academic achievement, school climate, staff morale, community relations, or any combination of these, as well as others not mentioned here. The second focus of the study was to isolate the types of strategies and actions principals undertook in order to realize their visions and to learn whether these strategies and actions were focused on daily routine or tended towards more comprehensive and intensive change efforts.

Methodology

This study utilized a qualitative descriptive research design. Individual interviews with elementary schools principals provided the needed data. A sample of principals representing the Responder, Manager, and Initiator Principal Styles was interviewed to determine how these different styles of principals attempt to translate their visions into practice. Stevens (1986)

provides a more detailed description of the methodology used in the study.

Sample Selection. The selection of study principals involved several steps: 1) principals volunteered for the study, 2) their supervisors categorized the principals by principal style, 3) face-to-face interviews with individual principals were conducted, and 4) screening of principals for continued inclusion in the study was performed after the interviews.

Sixteen elementary principals out of a total of 53 elementary principals volunteered for the study. Four principals were dropped from the study for several reasons: One principal moved to another position; another principal's school contained a junior high component; and two principals had interview responses which indicated they might have been incorrectly classified by their supervisors.

Of the 12 principals remaining in the study, four were classified as Responders, four as Managers, and four as Initiators. These 12 principals made up the sample of the study. This even numerical breakdown was not by design. When the supervisors were briefed on the categories and given the written style description, they were requested to categorize their principals by principal style. At no time were the supervisors given any indication that a specific number of principals under each style was required.

Instrumentation. Based on the research questions and the Hall and Rutherford (1983) framework, informal exploratory

discussions with educators not in the study were conducted in order to generate initial questions for the design of the interview questions and the interview format.

One principal not in the study was interviewed to provide field testing for the initial interview questions. The field test revealed that the interview questions were too cumbersome and time consuming. The interview questions were then reviewed and subsequently revised by the researcher in a more condensed and time efficient format that would allow the interview time to be kept to be to approximately one hour or less. By reducing the interview time, the data could be more meaningful since the principals would be less fatigued than in a more lengthy interview.

The final interview instrument utilized a blend of two interview formats: the "Standardized Open-Ended Interview" (Patton, 1980) and the "Interview Guide" (Patton, 1980). In the Standardized Open-Ended Interview: "The exact wording and sequence of questions are determined in advance. All interviewees are asked the same basic question in the same order" (Patton, 1980, p. 6). In the Interview Guide: "Topics and issues to be covered are specified in advance, in outline form; the interviewer decides sequence and wording of questions in the course of the interview." (Patton, 1980, p. 7).

In this study both of these formats were combined into a hybrid. Standard questions were written out prior to the interviews and asked in sequence. In order to make the interview

flow more smoothly and to make the respondents more comfortable with the interview process, the questions were not read to the interviewee, but stated in a conversational tone. This meant that there were variations in the phrasing of the questions, but the basic content remained the same.

After the standard questions had been phrased in the individual interviews, the interviewer probed for greater clarity or detail when necessary. In some instances the interviewer asked the respondent to verify whether or not the interviewer had correctly understood a particular response. The follow-up questions were very specific to each interview. They were used to enrich the basic answers with greater detail.

Data Collection. The data collection consisted of a total of 12 interviews that were used for this study. The researcher made interview notations during the interview. Also the interviewer tape recorded the interviews, since permission was given by all of the interviewees to do so. This combination of data collection was made for several reasons as Patton (1980) suggested: 1) taped data is very reliable, 2) "taking notes about what is said will help later analysis," and 3) "in addition, note taking is one of the nonverbal behaviors that helps pace the interview."

Data Analysis. Recommendations for qualitative analysis made by Miles and Huberman (1984) and Patton (1980) were considered. The tape recordings were transcribed by another person not connected with the study. This transcription by

another individual added to the degree of objectivity of the study. The data from the transcribed tapes were compared against the interview notes and utilized in verifying the accuracy of the interview notes. Gaps in interview notes were filled from consulting the transcriptions of the taped interviews. One of the taped interviews was missing a segment, because the interviewer had failed to turn a tape over during an interview. The missing data were reconstructed with the aid of the interview notes.

The transcribed interviews were reduced into more manageable notes by the deletion of redundant material. This was accomplished by selecting representative quotations for each principal and by paraphrasing a number of lengthy statements into more concise data. During this first data reduction, the interview notes were again consulted for comparison. This comparison was useful aid in capturing the essence of the principals' interview responses.

In order to answer the research questions, there were two major thrusts to the data analysis. One dealt with vision and the other with strategies for attaining these visions.

The visions of principals were quoted and listed by principal style. Patterns were identified, categories for analysis were created, and conclusions were drawn. These were reviewed and verified against the data summaries and finally against the original raw data itself to reduce the possibility that somehow important data had not been included in reaching the

conclusions.

A similar process was utilized in the analysis of data in relation to the strategies of principals for attaining their visions. Strategies by principal style were identified and grouped under principal function categories based on the work of Hall and Rutherford (1983). Again, patterns were identified, categorized, and conclusions were derived. These too were verified against the original data before final conclusions were drawn.

Conclusions regarding visions and role functions were derived by initially organizing them in quantitative displays. Those that showed a strong tendency in one principal style or across the three styles were closely scrutinized for qualitative comparisons. By combining vision findings and material from role functions, the researcher was able to see the emergence of a clear picture of each principal style. The final conclusions were drawn after all data had been collected, summarized, displayed, and analyzed.

Visions Held By Principals Of The Three Styles: Findings and Discussion

Findings. Table 1 contains four categories of visions held by the three principal styles. These categories were created by the researcher after data collection. Within the four categories the researcher added thirteen vision subcategories also presented in Table 1.

Managers and Initiators held visions related to all four

Table 1

Percentages of Respondents of the Three Principal
Styles by Vision Type

Visions	Responders Percent	Managers Percent	Initiators Percent
Instruction Related			
Program	75	50	100
Teaching Practices	25	--	--
Computers	--	--	25
Teacher Related			
Staffing Changes	25	--	25
Quality of Staff			
Upgraded	--	25	--
Teacher Motivation			
or Morale	50	--	25
Pupil Teacher Ratio	25	--	--
Student Related			
Student Achievement			
or Success	--	50	50
Student Motivation	--	25	--
School to Help			
Student and Their			
Families to Live			
Each Day a Little			
Better	--	--	25
Other Related			
Counselors	50	--	--
Facilities	50	50	--
Parent or Community	--	25	50

categories: Instruction, Teacher, Student, and Other.

Responders held the same type of vision categories except for student-related visions.

The data yielded essentially two sets of findings. One set deals with visions across the 13 vision types. The other set relates to visions about programs.

Apart from program-related visions, which were common to all three principal styles, Table 1 reveals that:

1. Responders and Managers shared facilities-related visions. Principals of both styles would like to have improved or expanded facilities.

2. Managers and Initiators shared two vision types, Student Achievement or Success, and Parent or Community. Both of these two styles envisioned students being successful and meeting high standards, and both wanted parent or community backing.

3. Responders and Initiators shared two types of visions related to Staffing Changes and TEacher Motivation or Morale. In terms of Staffing Changes, while the Responder Style Principal sought stability, the Initiator desired turnover to increase flexibility. Teacher Morale for one responder meant knowing they were "doing a good job," while the Initiator wanted his/her teachers to know "that they are the hottest things around."

Out of the 13 vision types, only one category, Programs, was shared by all three principal styles. There were 75 percent of Responder, 50 percent off Manager, and 100 percent of Initiator Principal Styles who indicated they had program-related visions.

This breakdown would indicate that Initiators and Responders had the strongest program-related visions, while Manager Principals had the weakest program-related visions. However, viewing visions simply by percentages of principals of each style is somewhat misleading. When one looks at the qualitative aspects of the visions, an expanded and more accurate picture emerges.

Responders actually were the weakest in terms of program-related visions, because their visions tended to address programs in general and indirect terms. Responder 01 would like to see a "reduction in student teacher ratio...school going to full-time kindergarten classes..." Principal 02 envisioned a "reduction in pull-out programs." Responder Principal 03 would like to see "curriculum matters and teaching to fit individual students...; (the school) to continue boundary exemptions for kids who need Slingerland program." The program-related visions of Responder Principals were not visions which had tangible application to the school, but voiced a knowledge of certain trends in education in general. Implementation would have little to do with the principal other than to support the program if it happened.

Manager program visions were more directly related to program quality. Principal 06 wanted a strengthened Slingerland program and "the school to be a model for the Anchorage Writing Project and for science education...the math program to be superior." Principal 08 would like to eliminate the Slingerland program at the third and fourth grade level and just leave it in grades one and two. Although some Manager program visions

focused more on program substance than was the case for Responder program visions, overall, one must conclude that Managers as a group did not have intense program concerns as only half of the Managers revealed program-related vision.

Of the three principal styles, Initiator Principals had the strongest program-related visions seen both from a quantitative and a qualitative perspective. All Initiator Principals in this study expressed program related visions. These visions tended to be the most substantive and comprehensive of all the program visions. Initiator Principal 09 would like "more being done with the recreational reading program...(and) the entire school to do DEAR, 'Drop Everything and Read.'" Initiator 10 would like to see "the oral language curriculum to be really in place...(and) children being really familiar with a good story base of pieces of classical literature, etc. He/she also had a vision where children feel "comfortable with the tools of mathematics and see how the logical thought process of math help them with problem solving in everyday life...(and) that children see computers as a tool for their writing process." Principal 12 would like to see a program that "deals with the total student--the different domains--and that there be a continued emphasis on arts and creative activities." The program-related visions of Initiators tended to incorporate specific ideas for improving the education of children.

Discussion. Responders' visions were scattered and related to the mission of the school in a peripheral way, such as

concerns with facilities and need for counselors. The visions of Responders did not impact the education of children in a direct and immediate way. It appears that these principals preferred to beat around the bush, to use a worn but apt phrase.

Hall and Rutherford (1983) said that Responders did not "articulate visions of how their schools and staffs should change in the future" (p. 201). The finding of this study are slightly different as some Responder Principals did offer visions about changes in their schools. However, these changes were of a rather general nature that would imply policy changes at the district level rather than changes brought about by Responders at their schools.

When program-related visions and student-achievement or success-related visions are collapsed into one category, program impact on students, Manager Principals emerge as having stronger program concerns than seen earlier, as all Manager Principals would fall into this category. This would bring Managers close to Initiator Principals, because both were strong in this category. Manager Principals were similar also to Responder Principals in terms of qualitative and quantitative facilities-related vision. These conclusions are in line with the findings of Hall and Rutherford (1983) that Managers sometimes behave like Responders and sometimes like Initiators.

Initiator Principals' visions were uniquely focused on school programs. As has been mentioned earlier, Initiators were the strongest in terms of program visions. Initiators also were

different from both Responders and Managers in the sense that Initiators reported nearly one-half more visions overall than did either Responder or Manager Principals in this study. This supports the Hall and Rutherford (1983) findings and may in part point to reasons why Initiators tend to have the greatest implementation success. Clearly, Initiators have the greatest number of visions and as such may engage in more goal focused activities than Responders or Managers. The following section illuminates this in greater detail.

Strategies For Achieving The Visions Held By The Three Principal Styles: Findings and Discussion.

Findings. Hord, Huling, and Stiegelbauer (1983) categorized eight different functions of principals engaged in "school improvement efforts." Seven of these were adapted for this study. These are: 1) Organizing and Supporting, 2) Training, 3) Counseling, 4) Monitoring, 5) External Communications, 6) Dissemination, and 7) Expressing/Responding to Concerns. Principals in this study reported actions, including future actions, ranging from two to six functions.

Table 2 presents the strategies used for achieving these visions. The most frequently reported categories for the 12 study principals, in order of frequency, were: 1) Organizing and Supporting, Counseling, Training and Monitoring, 2) Dissemination and Expressing/Responding to Concerns, and 3) External Communication, which was reported by only one study principal.

There were several patterns of findings. Major functions

Table 2

Percentages of Respondents of the Three
Principal Styles by Role Function

Functions	Responders Percent	Managers Percent	Initiators Percent
1. Organizing and Supporting	75	100	100
2. Training	25	50	100
3. Counseling	100	50	50
4. Monitoring	25	50	100
5. External Communication			25
6. Dissemination	75	25	50
7. Expressing, Responding to Concerns	25	25	50

reported by Responder Principals were Counseling (100%), Organizing and Supporting (75%), and Dissemination (75%) related. For Managers the major functions were related to Organizing and Supporting (100%), Training (50%), Counseling (50%) and Monitoring (50%). The major functions reported by Initiator Principals were Organizing and Supporting (100%), Training (100%), Monitoring (100%), Counseling (50%), Dissemination (50%) and Expressing/Responding to Concerns (50)).

Responder Principals reported actions clustered mainly around Functions 1, 3, and 6. In terms of Organizing and Supporting, three responders made reference to policy and decision making. One of these was very general and only indicated that the principal should provide the leadership in a school. At the same time this principal conceded that the faculty did "not want to make any major changes." The implicit message was that the principal would not exert any significant leadership toward change, since he/she defined his/her direction in terms of what others wanted. The other two principals reported policy changes in relation to lunch procedures. One of these principals also made a district policy enforcement decision that teachers were to report to school no later than the district-mandated reporting time. Under Function 1, 50 percent of Responders also reported actions of a scheduling nature.

Responders were particularly strong under Function 3, Consulting and reinforcing. The emphasis here was on a consulting type of problem solving. Under Dissemination,

Function 6, Responders placed emphasis on "gaining support of outsiders." This ties in readily with the Responders' tendency to attempt to satisfy the concerns of others for the Responders' programs.

Manager principals' actions were strongest in terms of Function 1. All Managers reported actions related to Organizing and Supporting. The common thread that ran through Managers' actions under this function was their indirect approach to decision making. They reported that they liked to use a collegial approach. Beyond this a certain degree of manipulation emerged. Managers used terms such as "buy in," "ownership," "prewire," and "discussion" in relation to decision making. Manager Principals appeared to push for change up to the point where they met resistance.

Initiator Principals' actions ranged across more functions than Managers. Or Responders'. An average of 4.75 functions were reported for Initiator Principals, as opposed to an average of 3.25 functions for Responders and 3.0 functions for Managers. All Initiators reported actions related to Function 1 as did all Managers; however, Initiators were much more focused on policy, decision making, and planning than were Managers or Responders.

Along with this, Initiators were the strongest of the three styles under the training function. The emphasis here was on teaching new knowledge or skills. In terms of training, Initiators were strongest in quantitative as well as qualitative terms. While 25 percent of Responders and 50 percent of Managers

indicated a concern with training, all Initiators reported actions under this function. An even greater difference is evident when one investigates the qualitative aspects of the training concerns of the three principal styles. Where Responder Style Principals talked of sending "teachers to other schools ... (and giving) them professional literature," and Manager Style Principals voiced ideas of providing "opportunities for training for groups of individuals," Initiators cited substantial training activities. They talked about specifics such as putting teachers into "peer coaching situations," having teachers "trained at the awareness level in lesson design," "increasing teachers' skills in using the computer in the classroom as an instructional tool," and themselves putting on inservice activities relevant to their aims for the school.

Initiators were also stronger under Function 4, Monitoring and Evaluation, than were Responders and Managers. One hundred percent of Initiators reported actions under this function. It is important to make the distinction that actually all study principals were involved in monitoring and evaluation activities, because all study principals were required to evaluate certificated and non-certificated staff. Furthermore, all of the study principals' schools were routinely engaged in standardized testing activities. This analysis is concerned with principal style differences beyond these district-mandated activities.

Responder and Manager Style Principals concerned themselves with change on a small scale, daily basis. Initiators also dealt

with daily kinds of change efforts, but displayed by far the strongest commitment to larger, more comprehensive change efforts.

As can be seen from Table 3, on a continuum between daily, small scale, and comprehensive large scale change efforts, all Responders preferred to make small scale changes. This was also the case for 75 percent of the Manager Style Principals. There were 25 percent of the Manager Style Principals and 100 percent of Initiator Style Principals who perceived themselves to be engaged in both daily, small scale change activities as well as working on more comprehensive, large scale change efforts.

Discussion. This study found that Responder Style Principals' actions under Organizing and Supporting were of a general and diffused nature as far as the main purpose of the school was concerned. When one considers the visions of responder Style Principals, this could be expected. As was mentioned earlier under the discussion of Research Question 2, responders' visions rarely dealt directly with the main mission of the school, i.e., the education of children. It appears that Responders' actions relating to school programs, like Responders' visions, were indirect and peripheral, as a preoccupation with lunchroom procedures and scheduling indicated.

Responder Style Principals emerged as the strongest of the three principal styles under Counseling, Function 3. The emphasis here was on a consulting type of problem solving. This was not at all expected, as this kind of counseling function

Table 3

Respondents Reported Percentage of Preferred
Scope of Change Efforts by Principal Style

Daily Small Scale Only	Percent	Comprehensive Large Scale Only	Percent	Combination of Both	Percent
Responders	100	Responders	0	Responders	0
Managers	75	Managers	0	Managers	25
Initiators	0	Initiators	0	Initiators	100

lends itself readily to trying to satisfy individuals and dealing with immediate problems, as has been shown by Hall and Rutherford (1983) to be a major characteristic of responder style Principals.

"Gaining support of outsiders" was a major concern of responders under Function 6, Dissemination. Responder Style Principals' strength under this function readily falls into the pattern for Responders, who tend to take their cues from others and do not have their own clear visions and directions.

Manager Style Principals averaged a range of 3.0 functions. On its face, these data regarding Manager Principals were surprising. Hall and Rutherford (1983) had reported that Managers had the greatest number of interventions of the three principal styles. They reasoned that this was due to the Manager's penchant for trying "to do it all by him or herself" (Hall & Rutherford, 1983); therefore, Managers would have more interventions. One might expect that along with the most interventions there would also be the broadest range of functions. This was not the case in this study; however, if one considers that in the Hall and Rutherford study mentioned above where all interventions made by anyone were included, then the findings for Managers were not exceptional.

This study found that Manager Style Principals were strongest under Function 1, Organizing and Supporting, and that while Manager Style Principals tended to be manipulative, they would hesitate to push for change in the face of resistance.

This might account for the Hall and Rutherford (1983) conclusions that Manager Principals have the highest degree of staff morale of the three styles, while their innovation implementation success is not the highest of the three styles. Stopping short of confrontation might have a positive relationship to staff morale but might also logically limit the degree of change necessary to successfully implement desirable innovations.

Initiator Style Principals emerged as having the greatest range of functions of the three principal styles. Principals utilizing the Initiator Style averaged almost 50 percent more functions than principals of the other two principal styles. Again, as under visions, Initiator Style Principals simply appeared to do more.

In terms of policy and decision making, Initiators had some similarities to Managers in that they too tended toward a collegial approach. Initiators obviously understood that involving them in the decision-making process those who would be affected by the decisions would tend to be a useful tool in achieving desired goals. Initiators were, however, more persistent in dealing with resistance than were Managers. One might safely say that Initiators were most aggressive in attaining their visions. They knew what they wanted; they had a clear vision, and they had or developed a clear plan of how to get there.

This was illustrated further in the Initiator Style Principals' concerns with the training function. In terms of

training, Initiators were found to have the greater quantitative and qualitative involvement of the three styles. This depth of concern of Initiator style Principals regarding training was not surprising, since Initiators are expected to have clear visions and to work diligently at attaining them. The training function emphasis for Initiators was a distinct example of how Initiator Principals push for change. Just as their visions are clear and tend to be program- and student-oriented, Initiators also had a very clear idea how to have these visions realized, and their training functions tended to be a significant part of this.

Initiator style Principals were also found to be particularly strong under the Monitoring function. This finding for Initiators appears to be a variance with the Hall and Rutherford (1983) Initiators who had a similar number of interventions under this function as did Managers. Nevertheless, this study's findings are not unusual for Initiators. One would expect principals with clear visions and a detailed understanding of how to achieve their visions to be concerned with monitoring and evaluating in order to be able to focus their activities more effectively.

Out of this study one derives a very clear and unambiguous picture of the Initiator Style Principal as being goal-oriented, decisive, knowledgeable, and aware. This notion was further enhanced by the findings regarding the scope of change efforts that Initiator Style Principals willingly undertake. All very clearly had daily as well as long-range concerns. One Initiator

seemed to sum up the Initiator Style approach to change by saying that one "must have a sense of direction, everything you do must be geared to move you into that direction." Perhaps one might see the Initiator Style Principal as being the most willing of the three principal styles to do what needs to be done within an overall framework.

Summary and Conclusions

1. There were quantitative as well as qualitative differences in many of the visions of the principals. Initiator Style Principals had the greatest number of visions of the three principal styles. Initiator visions were the most detailed and integrated with the other visions held by the same principals.

2. Principals of all three styles had program related visions; however, Initiator Style Principals had the strongest program related-visions, and Responder Style Principals had the weakest program-related visions of the three styles.

3. Manager and Responder Style Principals shared similar quantitative and qualitative type of visions regarding school facilities.

4. Responder Style Principals were most interested in bureaucratic matters, and attempted to satisfy the concerns of others. Responders preferred to operate in a counseling or consultative mode.

5. Although Manager Style Principals were found to work towards attaining their visions, they were less persistent than Initiator Style Principals in the face of staff opposition.

6. Initiator Style Principals engaged in a broader range of functions than did Responder or Manager Style Principals.

Initiators emphasized organizing and supporting, training, and the monitoring of processes and results.

7. Initiator Style Principals pushed the hardest for change and appeared to work more extensively towards attaining long-range visions than did Responder or Manager Style Principals.

The results of the analysis of the sample principal interviews suggested the following conclusions:

1. The visions of the three principal styles are different. Initiators' visions focus on school programs and are integrated with other visions held by the same principal. Visions of Responders are vague and diffused. Manager Style Principals' program-related visions are stronger than those of responder Principals, but less focused than Initiators' program visions.

2. Initiator Principals have the greatest number of visions of the three principal styles. Managers and Responders have similar numbers of visions.

3. Responder principals function mainly in a counseling of consultative mode. Their major concerns focus on bureaucratic matters and on satisfying the concerns of others.

4. Initiators utilize the greatest range of strategies of the three principal styles. Of the three styles, Initiator principal work the most intensely toward achieving long-range visions. Although Manager style principals work toward attaining visions, they are reluctant to vigorously pursue these visions

when faced with opposition.

Implications

The fact that Initiator, Manager and Responder style principals have different types of visions and different types of strategies for reaching these visions has several implications for the selection and nurturing of principals. We suspect that visions of principals can be improved through coaching and assistance. Fullan (1982), Huberman and Miles (1984), and Crandall, Eiseman and Louis (1986) suggest that such improved visions would have several characteristics: a) they would include directions supported by thoughtful review of values and guiding principles as well as by research and effective practice elsewhere, b) they would have clarity and a focus of instructional improvement, and c) they would have complexity yet consist of definable components, d) they would be seen as having a "fit" between the vision and the organization from the visionary's perspective (but not necessarily from the teacher perspective) and e) represent a demanding scope of change for the teachers while not overloading the institution.

Principals also will need coaching and assistance in linking vision to strategies for implementing these visions. Implementation of the vision will need to take several forms. Dwyer (1984) has emphasized the view that linkage will best be done within the daily routine and daily opportunities in the life of the principal. A complementary view comes from the implementation literature which emphasizes the importance of

strategic planning and a planning process for implementation that includes cross-role hierarchical teams (Huberman & Miles, 1984; Berman & Marsh, 1984; Crandall, Eiseman, & Louis, 1986). Rallis & Highsmith (1986) make a similar point in arguing that the principal alone can not be the great school leader.

But the appropriate principal style remains a complex issue. We suspect that the responder style would rarely, if ever, be appropriate. The issue is better stated as to when the manager style is more appropriate or effective, and when the initiator style is more appropriate or effective. Louis (1986) reports that strong local visions of secondary principals may conflict with the district priorities and visions in an unproductive way. Stated more generally, can school principals have strong meaningful visions in situations where the state and/or the district leaders also have strong visions? Manager style principals may be needed in such situations to carry out the district vision, as suggested by Hall & Rutherford (1983). Alternatively, school principals may need to create complementary visions, often with a more student-centered quality (possibly including guidance services, positive school climate, attendance or student supportive programs) that allow the district or state vision to work in the school.

We suspect that effective secondary principals may need to be more managers than initiators in style. Secondary principals have a more complex physical plant and organizational setting, and often lack the expertise to initiate in the various academic

areas represented at the school. In turn, with strong department chairs, administrator assistance and teacher leaders at the secondary school, a team arrangement seems increasingly feasible.

The problem of which style of principal to select and nurture has several dimensions. It is first a matter of matching principal style to the circumstances of district and state visions-- strong district or state visions may require a principal with a managerial rather than an initiator style. It is also a matter of assessing the demands of the school itself-- secondary schools may need a manager style while some elementary schools may always need an initiator style or a balance over time between manager and initiator styles. In any case, we think that principal styles can be changed to some extent through training, assistance, and monitoring. At the same time, there are limits as to how much change can be made within constraints of talent and temperament.

References

- Berman, P. and Marsh, D. (1984, April). How secondary schools differ from elementary schools in implementing school reform efforts. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New Orleans.
- Brightman, H. J. (1984). Improving principals' performance through training in the decision sciences. Educational administration quarterly, 18(3), 33-64.
- Campbell, R. F., Cunningham, L. L., Nystrand, R. O., and Usdan, M. D. (1980). The organization and control of American education (4th ed.). Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.
- Crandall, D., Eiseman, J., and Louis, K. (1986). Strategic planning issues that bear on the success of school improvement efforts. Educational administration quarterly, 22(3), 21-53.
- Dwyer, D. C. (1984). The search for instructional leadership routines and subtleties in the principal's role. Educational leadership, 41(5), 32-37.
- Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hall, G. E., and Rutherford, W. L. (1983, April). Three change facilitators styles: How principals affect improvement efforts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- Hall, G. E., Rutherford, W. L., Hord, S. M., Huling, L. L. (1984). The effects of three principal styles on school improvement. Educational leadership, 41(5), 22-29.
- Hord, S. M., Huling, L. L., Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1983, April). An analysis of interventions in school improvement efforts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- Huberman, M. and Miles, M. (1984). Innovation up close: How school improvement works. New York: Plenum.
- Leithwood, K. A., and Montgomery, D. J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of educational research, 52(3), 309-339.
- Louis, K. (1986). Reforming secondary schools: A critique and an agenda for administrators. Educational leadership, 44(1), 33-36.

- Manasse, L. A. (1984). Principals as leaders of high performing systems. Educational leadership, 41(5), 42-46.
- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Peterson, K. D. (1978). The principal's tasks. Administrator's notebook, 26(8), 1-4.
- Rallis, S. and Highsmith, M. (1986). The myth of the "great principal": Questions of school management and instructional leadership. Phi delta kappan, 68(4), 300-304.
- Roe, W. H., and Drake, T. L. (1980). The principalship (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., and Craver, F. D. (1973). The new school executive: A theory of administration. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stevens, W. (1986). The role of vision in the life of elementary school principals. Unpublished dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Trider, D., and Leithwood, K. (1987). Influences on principal's practices. Curriculum inquiry (in press).
- Willower, D. J. (1982, March). The managerial behavior of elementary school principals. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.